

REMARKS

A Summary of the Applicant-Initiated Examiner Interview that occurred on 11/08/2005 is provided hereinabove.

In the current and non-final Office Action dated 08/10/2005, claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 were examined.

Claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 were rejected.

Specifically:

Claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 were "rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gong (WO 99/30217)."

Of pending claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56, six (6) claims 1, 24, 25, 37, 49, and 53 are independent. These six independent claims 1, 24, 25, 37, 49, and 53 are addressed below.

1 I. It is respectfully submitted that Gong does not anticipate (or render  
2 obvious) independent claim 1, 24, 25, or 37.

3  
4 A. Gong does not describe or suggest the merging of permissions.

5  
6 B. Thus, no art of record, either alone or in any combination,  
7 anticipates or renders obvious at least the following elements in conjunction  
8 with the other elements of their respective claims:

9 Claim 1: generating the permission grant set by merging two or more  
10 code-group permission sets, each code-group permission set of  
11 the two or more code-group permission sets being associated  
12 with a code group in which the code assembly is a member.

13 Claim 24: generating the permission grant set by merging two or  
14 more code-group permission sets, each code-group permission  
15 set of the two or more code-group permission sets being  
16 associated with a code group in which the code assembly is a  
17 member.

18 Claim 25: generating the permission grant set by merging two or  
19 more code-group permission sets, each code-group permission  
20 set of the two or more code-group permission sets being  
21 associated with a code group in which the code assembly is a  
22 member.

23 Claim 37: generating the permission grant set by merging two or  
24 more code-group permission sets, each code-group permission  
25 set of the two or more code-group permission sets being

1 associated with a code group in which the code assembly is a  
2 member.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1       II. It is respectfully submitted that Gong does not anticipate (or render  
2 obvious) independent claim 49 or 53.

3  
4       A. On page 2 in the "Response to Arguments" section at  
5 paragraph no. 3, the current Office Action reads:

6               Referring to the independent claims 49 and 53, Applicant argues that Gong  
7 does not address verification in any relationship with permission rights. With  
8 respect to this argument examiner points out that the instant claims do not recite  
9 that the verification is performed in "relationship with permission rights".  
10 Referring to the instant claims the limitation "performing verification on the code  
11 assembly" is met by Fig. 4 and the limitation "determining whether the code  
12 assembly may be executed despite the verification failure" is met by block 428 in  
13 Fig.4.

14       Gong indicates that its "Figure 4 is a flow chart showing the steps involved in  
15 implementing protection domains in accordance with an embodiment of the present  
16 invention;" It is respectfully submitted that this does not equate to **performing**  
17 **verification on the code assembly** (claim 49). If this rejection is maintained against  
18 claim 49, then an explanation is requested of how establishing a protection domain  
19 for a class and/or a mapping there between can possibly correspond to **performing**  
20 **verification on the code assembly** (claim 49).

21       Block 428 of Figure 4 of Gong reads, "Establish Mapping Of Class To  
22 Protection Domain?" It is noted that the question mark in block 428 appears to be a  
23 typographical error. Gong reads on page 12, at lines 21-24, "Next, in step 428, the  
24 mapping of the class to the protection domain is established. The mapping of the  
25 class to the protection domain is added to a mapping data structure maintained  
within the domain mapper 248. In this example, a mapping between class 260 and  
protection domain object 282 is created." It is respectfully submitted that there is no

1 conditional determination; instead, a mapping is established. If this rejection is  
2 maintained against claim 49, then an explanation is requested as to how this can  
3 possibly correspond to **determining whether the code assembly may be executed**  
4 **despite the verification failure, responsive to the evaluating operation (claim**  
5 **49).**

6  
7 B. Gong only describes verification in the limited context of  
8 determining whether a class is to be considered an unsigned class.

9 By way of example, it appears that Gong addresses verification in only one  
10 paragraph:

11 A class may be associated with the digital signature associated with the file  
12 used to transport code defining the class, or the class definition of the class may be  
13 specifically associated with a digital signature. A class that is associated with a  
14 valid digital signature is referred to as being signed. Valid digital signatures are  
15 digital signatures that can be verified by known keys stored in a database. If a class  
16 is associated with a digital signature which can not be verified, or the class is not  
17 associated with any digital signature, the class is referred to as being unsigned.  
18 Unsigned classes may be associated with a default key. A key may be associated  
19 with a name, which may be used to look up the key in the database.

20 (WO 99/30217, Page 8, Lines 28-35.)

21 Thus, Gong does not describe **determining whether the code assembly may**  
22 **be executed despite the verification failure, responsive to the evaluating**  
23 **operation (claim 49) or determining based on the permission grant set that a**  
24 **step of a verification process is unnecessary (claim 53).**

25 C. Thus, no art of record, either alone or in any combination,  
anticipates or renders obvious at least the following elements in conjunction  
with the other elements of their respective claims:

1 Claim 49: evaluating the evidence relative to the security policy . . .  
2 *performing verification on the code assembly . . . detecting a*  
3 *verification failure of the code assembly in the operation of*  
4 *performing verification . . . determining whether the code*  
5 *assembly may be executed despite the verification failure,*  
6 *responsive to the evaluating operation.*

7 Claim 53: generating a permission grant set, responsive to the  
8 evaluating operation . . . *determining based on the permission*  
9 *grant set that a step of a verification process is unnecessary . . .*  
10 *communicating to a verification module that the step of the*  
11 *verification process may be bypassed . . . performing the*  
12 *verification process on the code assembly with the verification*  
13 *module . . . bypassing the step of the verification process,*  
14 *responsive to the communicating operation.*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1        III. It is respectfully submitted that Gong does not anticipate (or render  
2 obvious) dependent claims 2-23, 38-45, 50-52 and 54-56.

3  
4        Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 37, 49, and 53 have  
5 been provided above. Claims 2-23, 38-45, 50-52 and 54-56 depend from these  
6 independent claims 1, 37, 49, and 53, respectively.

7  
8        Each dependent claim also includes additional element(s) militating toward  
9 allowability. For example, certain claims (e.g., claims 10-16 and 40-42) recite  
10 element(s) directed to a **policy level**. It is noted that Gong does not describe or  
11 suggest **policy level** as claimed.

12  
13        Nevertheless, it is also respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are  
14 allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective  
15 independent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims 1-25, 37-45, and 49-56 are allowable, and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 12/12/2005

By: Keith W. Saunders  
Keith W. Saunders  
Reg. No. 41,462  
(509) 324-9256 x238